United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.45

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 13 November 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Expression of sympathy in connection with the recent tsunami in the Philippines

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-56216 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Expression of sympathy in connection with the recent tsunami in the Philippines

1. **The Chair**, on behalf of all the members of the Committee, expressed sympathy to the Government of the Philippines in connection with the recent tsunami in its country.

2. *At the invitation of the Chair, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.*

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (A/68/53 and A/68/53/Add.1)

3. **Mr. Henczel** (Poland), President of the Human Rights Council, introducing the report of the Human Rights Council (A/67/53), said that the Council had made significant progress in dealing with human-rights issues in the seven years since its establishment. Syria had remained high on the Council's agenda and the mandate of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry for the Syrian Arab Republic had once again been extended. The Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had also been established, and existing special procedures mandates for that country, and for Myanmar, Iran, Belarus and Eritrea, had been extended.

4. The Council's creative methods of work had facilitated its dialogue with States. Interactive dialogues with high-ranking officials from the Central African Republic and Somalia had been held at the request of the States themselves, a commendable initiative. The Council had continued to discuss human rights issues concerning the Occupied Palestinian Territory and had adopted a number of other country-specific resolutions in the context of technical cooperation and capacity building.

5. During its previous three regular sessions, the Council had held 13 panel discussions on such themes as the impact of corruption on human rights, the contribution of parliaments to the universal periodic review, the rights of children, gender integration and the promotion of technical cooperation in the administration of justice. The Council had also held a high-level panel discussion to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and review the achievements, best practices and challenges. The high-level panel on human-rights mainstreaming, held with the participation of senior officials of United Nations agencies and the Secretary-General, had focused on human rights and the post-2015 development agenda, with a special emphasis on the right to education. The panels had benefited from the wide range of perspectives and expertise of representatives from Governments, international organizations, academia and civil society.

6. At its twenty-fifth session in March 2014, the Council would hold a number of panel and thematic discussions on such issues as the right to education of persons with disabilities and the question of the death penalty. The Council had established new special procedures mandates, including both country and thematic mandates, bringing the total number of mandates to 51.

7. In 2013, the Council had adopted 107 resolutions, decisions and President's statements. Many resolutions and decisions had been adopted without a vote, which illustrated that the Council was increasingly able to agree on issues relating to the protection of those in greatest need, and the number of cross-regional initiatives and joint statements had continued to increase.

8. The participation in the Council's high-level segment in March 2013 attested to its growing influence as the main United Nations body dealing with human rights issues, as did the growing number of civil society representatives attending Council proceedings. The active participation of civil society organizations was central to the proper functioning of the Council and made it unique among other United Nations intergovernmental organs. It was therefore essential for representatives of civil society to operate in a free, open and safe environment. He had condemned reprisals and considered it the Council's responsibility to address all cases of intimidation or reprisals and to ensure unhindered access to all who sought to cooperate with the Council and the universal periodic review. In that regard, Council resolution 24/24, in which the Secretary-General was asked to designate a senior focal point on reprisals, was of the utmost importance.

9. Progress had been made towards making the Council's work accessible to persons with disabilities, pursuant to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and in line with the mandate of the Council's task force on the issue. Together with the Council's facilitator on disability issues, he had met with the Chair of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Chair of that Committee's Working Group on Accessibility to commit to continued efforts to that end. At every Council session, the work of one panel had been made accessible, in addition to the annual panel on the rights of persons with disabilities.

10. He drew attention to chapter II of the Council's annual report (A/68/53) and the annex thereto, in which resolutions containing recommendations to the General Assembly were listed. Decision 22/115 on the Human Rights Council webcast of March 2013 recommended that the General Assembly should consider ways to ensure sustainable live webcasting and subsequent webcast storage for Council meetings held during the Council's sessions and those of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. In the absence of summary records, webcasting provided the only official record of Council proceedings and was also an invaluable outreach tool, hence the Council's concern at the lack of regular budget funding. The extrabudgetary resources of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) might not always be sufficient to provide for that essential service. He had written to the President of the General Assembly to seek that body's support for including a provision in the 2014-2015 biennium budget proposals for webcasting of the Council's meetings. He hoped that Member States would consider that request favourably.

11. Resolution 22/25 on the follow up to the report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict renewed the recommendation that the General Assembly should remain apprised of the matter until it was satisfied that appropriate action had been taken to implement the recommendations contained in the report and ensure justice for victims and accountability for perpetrators. Resolution 23/17 on national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights welcomed the endorsement by the General Assembly of the strengthening of opportunities for those institutions compliant with the Paris Principles to contribute to the work of the Council. Resolution 24/10 on human rights and indigenous peoples contained a recommendation that the General Assembly should consider changing the title of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations to the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Peoples. Resolution 24/26 underlined the need for the General Assembly to proclaim the International Decade for People of African Descent and to adopt the relevant draft programme of action. Lastly, Chapter II also contained a resolution on the geographical balance of the OHCHR staff.

12. Currently in its second cycle, the universal periodic review mechanism continued to receive positive feedback from all actors involved. However, it had faced challenges in upholding the principle of universality and avoiding any negative impact of bilateral or territorial issues on the process. To preserve the integrity of the process, he had reminded States that first, the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review was factual in nature and should reflect what had been said in the room by the State under review and participating delegations; second, all conclusions and/or recommendations contained in that report should reflect the position of the submitting States and/or the State under review and should not be construed as endorsed by the Working Group as a whole; third, all recommendations made during the review should be treated equally and listed only once in the body of the report; fourth, all recommendations should constitute a part of the outcome of the review, and the State under review should communicate to the Council its position on all recommendations received; and lastly, all recommendations should focus on human rights issues and should be consistent with the basis of the review, as defined in Council resolution 5/1. He appealed to all delegations to respect those principles and thereby support the integrity of the review mechanism.

13. Applying all existing practices and rules consistently to all States under review would strengthen the credibility of the review process and help ensure the success of its second cycle. The constructive, consensual and non-politicized approach maintained by the Council in 2013 had encouraged Israel to reengage with the review mechanism. He thanked the Member States that had helped delegations from countries which were far from Geneva or had no Permanent Mission there to attend Council meetings. In that connection, he had participated in the interregional seminar to facilitate the participation of least developed countries and small island developing States in the Council and its review mechanism, held in

Mauritius in July 2013. The Voluntary Technical Assistance Trust Fund to Support the Participation of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States in the work of the Human Rights Council had become operational; he thanked States that had contributed to the Fund and encouraged others to do so. In closing, he asked Member States for their support, through the Fifth Committee, in addressing the issue of the budgetary shortfall that had arisen from the fact that the OHCHR regular budget had not kept pace with the growth in the Council's high number of resolutions and resulting increase in mandates and activities.

14. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that he wondered how Member States might cooperate more effectively with the activities of the various commissions of inquiry so that those entities, which enabled the Council to engage in objective, expert investigation, would provide the Council with even more useful outcomes. He would also like to know the President's views on the method of public hearings conducted by commissions of inquiry for the purpose of attaining an objective assessment of human-rights situations.

15. **Mr. Strickland** (United States of America) said that his delegation welcomed the Council's renewal of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, its focus on freedom of expression and religious tolerance, and its denunciation of reprisals. He commended the extension of the human rights mandates related to the Islamic Republic of Iran, Belarus, Burma, Cambodia, Eritrea, Sri Lanka and the Syrian Arab Republic, and the establishment of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Council had continued to provide technical assistance to States on request and had established mandates to respond to emergencies in Mali and the Central African Republic.

16. His delegation was concerned by the Council's discriminatory treatment of Israel. It called on Member States to abolish the Council's biased agenda item dedicated to Israel and to ensure that the Council addressed human rights in Israel and the Palestinian territories in the same manner as it did human rights elsewhere.

17. **Ms. Kaljulate** (Observer for the European Union) requested further information regarding ways to follow up on the implementation of recommendations emanating from the universal periodic review and enhance the role of various stakeholders; ways in which States could ensure that enough resources were provided through OHCHR to fund the growing number of Council mandates, bearing in mind that the promotion of human rights should remain a high priority even when efficiencies were being sought; and what more could be done to raise the Council's profile on the ground and within the United Nations.

18. **Ms. Schönholzer** (Switzerland) said that the Council should focus more on implementing the recommendations made and the standards established by the Council's existing mechanisms and instruments instead of creating new ones. She wondered how the Council would manage to strengthen the implementation of its recommendations. In view of the growing number of subjects dealt with concurrently and in the same manner by the Third Committee and the Human Rights Council, it might be judicious for the Council to focus more on the substance of human rights issues and for the Third Committee to ensure their integration into the United Nations system and the activities of various United Nations entities on the ground, in order to ensure a better distribution of tasks between the two bodies.

19. **Mr. Medan** (Croatia) said that the Council's Consultative Group, which had a central role in the selection at the twenty-fifth session of candidates for the 18 special procedures mandates, had a particularly heavy workload. He wondered how the Council could best deal with the situation in relation to both the 2014 and future appointments.

20. **Mr. Sparber** (Liechtenstein) said that the Committee should not consider all decisions of the Council which had budgetary implications but should confine itself to those which constituted Council recommendations, namely those requiring action by the General Assembly. His Government did not view Council resolution 24/24 as a recommendation and warned against attempts to politicize its approval by the Fifth Committee. It welcomed the Council's request for the establishment of a senior focal point to address reprisals and intimidation related to cooperation with the United Nations, a long-neglected issue which was growing in importance given the rising number of special procedures and mechanisms.

21. The work of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic

was essential in order to address the situation in the country. The Commission and the Council should appeal to United Nations bodies to act on the Commission's findings and the Council should submit recommendations to the General Assembly regarding the judicial follow-up of crimes. The Commission should focus on the Syrian Government's systematic denial or restriction of humanitarian access to civilians, which could constitute a war crime under international law. Rather than referring to the matter incidentally in its reports, the Commission should examine the practice systematically and identify those responsible at the political level.

22. **Mr. Oliveira** (Brazil), recalling the significant human rights-related challenges faced by the international community in 2013, said that Member States had a collective responsibility to protect civilians and promote peace and respect for international law in a manner that reinforced the legitimacy and credibility of the Organization and of the Human Rights Council. The Council should be able to promote and protect human rights without selectivity, North-South schisms, politicization or double standards and in a manner that enhanced human dignity throughout the world. His delegation hoped the spirit of the Vienna Declaration and Plan of Action — adopted 20 years previously — would remain with the international community, that the recognition of the universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated dimensions of human rights would be upheld and that dialogue and cooperation would prevail.

23. As a strong supporter of the Council's methodology, which was based on transparency, non-selectivity and non-politicization, Brazil urged Member States to observe those principles, in particular when considering country-specific General Assembly resolutions. The international community should seriously discuss how to uphold certain fundamental human rights in the digital age, in the light of concerns about national security and criminal activity. To that end, States must reaffirm the inherent value of protecting individual privacy, which was essential for protecting the individual against abuses of power. In that regard, Brazil endorsed the statements made by the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the need to protect the right to privacy in the context of the new information and communications technology.

24. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that she would not respond to the statement made by the delegation of Liechtenstein out of respect for the interactive dialogue with the President of the Council, which should be impartial and non-politicized. She had hoped that the representative of Liechtenstein would refrain from politicizing the dialogue, and she urged him to abide by the rules of the interactive dialogue. Moreover, he should refrain from alluding to the situation in Syria at every opportunity, without rhyme or reason.

25. She would like to know whether the President of the Council would continue working on human rights through the lens of a country-specific approach, or whether he would, instead, open the way for fair discussion of human-rights situations in every country, including the developed ones.

26. **Mr. Henczel** (Poland), President of the Human Rights Council, thanked all delegations for their questions. The follow-up of the universal periodic review on the ground was the main focus of the second cycle, and it was not an easy task, as the increasing number of delegations participating in each review resulted in a growing number of recommendations. The recommendations must be sufficiently precise to be implemented, and he therefore welcomed the trend towards more specific recommendations. It was also important for States under review and the United Nations Secretariat to cluster all recommendations immediately upon completion of the plenary review, in order to facilitate the adoption of the national implementation plan. During the actual implementation phase, Council resolution 16/21 encouraged States to request assistance with implementation or follow-up and indicated that OHCHR might serve as a clearing house for such assistance. That measure was under consideration, and he hoped that it would soon be implemented.

27. The Council's work was far more visible than it had been a few years previously, owing to its constructive working atmosphere, initiatives taken by regional groups and the Council's ability to deal with urgent country-specific and thematic human-rights issues. However, much more could be done to increase its visibility, particularly at United Nations Headquarters and within the United Nations system as a whole. As the de facto main body dealing with human rights issues, the Council must also be more involved in relevant discussions within other United Nations bodies. He strongly encouraged the initiative envisaged

by the New York Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to organize post-session briefings.

28. In the interests of both the international community and the States concerned, it was vital to ensure that the commissions of inquiry and the special rapporteurs were provided with the broadest possible information on all matters of interest. The commissions of inquiry should be able to use all tools that fostered transparency, fairness and unhindered access to victims of human rights violations. To that end, hearings represented a step in the right direction.

29. The selection of 18 mandate holders in March 2014 would be a serious challenge for the five-member consultative group to be established in December 2013. In order to avoid a similar bottleneck six years ahead, the consultative group cycle should be adjusted so that, in future, the members were appointed in June and could begin their work earlier.

30. With regard to the politicization that might still exist in Council proceedings, he underlined some trends of importance. Most Council resolutions were tabled by cross-regional groups of sponsors, with the core groups leading informal processes that were as open as possible. That did not mean that the Council was a depoliticized body: it was unrealistic to expect that difficult human rights issues could be dealt with by simple consensus or without tension. It was crucial to ensure that all human rights issues could be discussed, all violations were addressed and no subject was considered taboo; a spirit of dialogue should prevail at the proceedings, and all Council presidents had worked to make such conditions the norm rather than the exception.

31. Moreover, consideration of country-specific resolutions was considerably less tense than in the past. The Group of African States had played a crucial role by sponsoring resolutions under item 10 of the Council's agenda. Such action had led to extremely constructive interactive dialogues on the Central African Republic and Somalia and to the establishment of country-specific mandates on the Central African Republic and Mali. However, voting could not be avoided in the case of certain resolutions, particularly under item 4 of the agenda. The Council must be in a position to address the violation of human rights at the country level under items 4, 7 or 10 in order to retain its current level of credibility.

32. With regard to comments on Council resolution 24/24, he noted that, unlike the General Assembly, the Council was required to work on human rights in close cooperation with civil society representatives. Unfortunately, there had been an increase in intimidation and reprisals against civil society representatives, and the Secretary-General reported annually to the Council on instances of reprisals against persons who had cooperated with special rapporteurs and other United Nations mechanisms. Council resolution 24/24, supported by Member States from all regional groups, addressed intimidation and reprisals with the aim of ensuring the proper functioning of the Council and of the United Nations system as a whole. Whatever the respective positions of delegates in New York or Geneva might be, a strong political signal must be sent that reprisals and intimidation against those who cooperated with the United Nations were taken very seriously by the Organization.

33. **Ms. Bibalou** (Gabon), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the Group reaffirmed the Council's mandate to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and make recommendations thereon, as set out in General Assembly resolution 60/251. Cooperation and genuine dialogue with a view to helping Member States comply with their human rights obligations was essential to that mandate; the Council should thus consider human rights issues on a universal, objective and non-selective basis.

34. The universal periodic review was essential to the promotion and protection of human rights. The United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance should therefore have adequate resources so that it could help States implement recommendations emanating from the review. The Group reiterated its support for the work of the Council's mechanisms and special procedures but was concerned by problems with its governance, in particular the erosion of the provisions of the institution-building package, which in the long term could undermine the Council's credibility, and by the unresolved funding shortage which could affect the implementation of its decisions and recommendations. OHCHR played an essential role in ensuring that the Council was appropriately supported in accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/141.

35. The Group supported discussion by the General Assembly of the Council's deliberations, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251. The request for the Secretary-General to appoint a senior focal point to prevent reprisals against those cooperating with United Nations bodies, contained in Council resolution 24/24, was of great importance. However, prior to the appointment, the General Assembly should discuss the matter further and a feasibility study should be conducted to take stock of existing mechanisms within United Nations bodies. The Group reiterated its rejection of such reprisals.

36. **Ms. Schlyter** (Observer for the European Union) said that the Council had succeeded in preserving the universality of the periodic review and had efficiently addressed its growing workload and the many challenges it faced. The European Union was concerned by the reprisals against and intimidation of civil society representatives cooperating with human rights mechanisms, and urged the Council to continue to foster civil society participation.

37. **Mr. Zhang** Guixuan (China) said that 2013 marked the twentieth anniversary of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which enshrined the universality and indivisibility of human rights. The Human Rights Council should remain fair, objective and non-selective and should respect State decisions on the upholding of human rights in accordance with national conditions. It should facilitate dialogue and cooperation among States on the basis of equality and mutual respect and should promote not only civil and political but also economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development. His delegation therefore regretted the politicization of human rights by certain States, which engaged in confrontation within the Council and used those rights as a pretext for interfering in other countries' internal affairs while ignoring their own human rights problems. Those States gave unequal treatment to different categories of rights, refused to take into consideration the national conditions of other countries, and attempted to impose their own models on others. Such practices did not contribute to the Council's work or the international human rights cause.

38. His Government participated in the human rights work of the United Nations and promoted those rights domestically. It had recently completed the second round of the universal periodic review, had been elected as a member of the Council for the period 2014-2016 and would work with the other members to uphold human rights.

39. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia) said that the Council should work in accordance with the mandate contained in General Assembly resolution 60/251, through which it had been established in order to address politicization and double standards in the promotion of human rights. It should therefore uphold those rights fairly, equitably and without distinction and should engage in constructive dialogue on specific human rights situations with the countries concerned. Solutions should not be based on a fixed formula but should fit specific circumstances and be adaptable to new developments.

40. The universal periodic review was vital to the international community's efforts to foster democracy and make progress in human rights. Recommendations emanating from the review should be realistic, and more technical assistance should be provided, in particular to developing countries, for the preparation of national reports and the implementation of recommendations.

41. In view of the increasing number of Council special procedures, mandate holders should continue to work in partnership with Member States and stakeholders in accordance with Council resolution 5/2, and should improve coordination to avoid duplication. They should work professionally, objectively and without politicization, in compliance with the Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate-holders of the Council.

42. **Mr. Lazarev** (Belarus) said that Belarus had implemented almost all of the recommendations emanating from the first cycle of the universal periodic review and was preparing for the second cycle, including by planning events under the auspices of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and OHCHR, with the participation of Governments and civil society.

43. His Government welcomed the Council resolutions drawing attention to the inadmissibility of unilateral coercive measures and called for the establishment of a special procedure to address that issue, or for its inclusion within the mandate of existing special procedures. Certain countries were seeking to impose their political and social development models on the rest of the world and were making a charade of the universal periodic review by

applying double standards. The Council's work was moving away from neutrality, balance and mutual respect in human rights issues and towards harsh lobbying in the interests of certain countries. Since the Council's decisions were adopted by a simple majority, those countries were able to force the inclusion in resolutions and decisions of adversarial provisions not supported by most States. The Council's working methods allowed a group of about 20 States to substitute their own views for the Council's and subsequently to present them as agreed language in decisions to be submitted to the Third Committee and the General Assembly. As an example, the President of the Council had spoken at length about country-specific resolutions in his introductory statement and had referred only briefly to the universal periodic review. That was a dangerous trend which should be addressed by the General Assembly.

44. **Mr.** Diyar **Khan** (Pakistan) said that his Government welcomed the adoption of the outcome of the universal periodic review of Pakistan without a vote. Pakistan engaged with the Council's special procedures mandates through the human rights treaty bodies in Geneva and had received visits from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. Member States' engagement with United Nations human rights mechanisms should be based on mutual respect and cooperation. Special procedures should work independently, impartially and transparently within their mandates and should avoid politically motivated country-specific measures.

45. In June 2011, Pakistan had ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and had withdrawn various reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention against Torture. He paid a tribute to the technical assistance provided by the United Nations in support of the 2013 elections in Pakistan.

46. His Government was concerned by the use of drones in surveillance and combat. It therefore welcomed the emerging debate on the legality and human rights implications of such operations, and the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. The Special Rapporteurs should study the matter further and submit clearer recommendations to the Council. His Government was ready to contribute to international consensus-building on the legality of the use of drones and called for the immediate cessation of drone strikes until a legal framework governing their use was finalized.

47. **Mr. Elbahi** (Sudan) said that mandate holders should carry out their tasks without politicization or selectivity, in line with the spirit of their mandate and the Human Rights Council's Code of Conduct. His Government would continue to cooperate with human rights mechanisms, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, in order to promote and protect human rights in his country. The Sudan had submitted its report to the universal periodic review process and, having made great strides towards implementing the recommendations, was ready to participate in the second cycle.

48. His Government's adoption of a ten-year comprehensive national plan of action on human rights had reinforced other related efforts to ensure the enjoyment of human rights by all its citizens, without discrimination. Efforts to promote children's rights included accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its two Optional Protocols, in addition to the relevant International Labour Organization conventions; those instruments provided the basis for domestic legislation on children's rights. Moreover, a comprehensive integrated system for the protection of human rights had begun work two years earlier, and child protection units had been established in the armed forces by the Ministry of the Interior. Laws on the armed forces, police and security prohibited the use or recruitment of children by the respective entities.

49. His Government had acceded to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and had enacted a law on persons with disabilities in 2009, in addition to establishing a national council on persons with disabilities.

50. The Sudan had established a strategy on protecting the rights of women and a special unit tasked with addressing violence against women. Women's

participation in economic and other activities was encouraged. The implementation of all national projects and international commitments on human rights was the responsibility of the Sudanese National Commission for Human Rights, which had been established in line with the Paris Principles and had begun its activities two years earlier. His country was working with neighbouring countries with which it had concluded bilateral agreements to prevent certain violations, particularly trafficking in persons and in organs.

51. His delegation hoped that the Council would be able to conduct its work to promote and protect human rights without injecting into it any ideas on which no internationally agreed understanding existed. Any new mechanism that the Council wished to establish must meet with the approval of Member States.

52. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the independent international fact-finding mission to investigate the implications of the Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, had noted in its report to the Council (A/HRC/22/63) that the Government of Israel had been carrying out illegal settlement activities since 1967 with the aim of annexing Palestinian land by changing the demographic composition, character, geographical nature and status of the Territory, thus preventing the establishment of a viable Palestinian State and undermining the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. The occupying Power was continuing to construct the separation wall, 95 per cent of which was on Palestinian land, while checkpoints, obstacles to movement and the permit regime associated with the wall impaired the Palestinian people's social and economic life and violated their human rights.

53. Israel's illegal colonization campaign was a serious breach of international law and constituted a war crime. The occupying Power's plan to build 20,000 settlement units in Occupied Palestine, unmasked recently by an Israeli non-governmental organization, revealed Israel's contempt for United Nations resolutions and for the international consensus that settlement activities should cease. By continuing with its settlement campaign, Israel was violating its obligation under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court not to transfer its population to the Occupied Palestinian Territory. The violence and intimidation perpetrated by a minority of settlers with the aim of forcing Palestinians off their land affected all spheres of Palestinian life. Protected by the Israeli Government, the extremists killed and injured civilians, destroyed property, contaminated water supplies and agricultural land, and desecrated religious buildings.

54. Israel could no longer be allowed to flout the law and should bear the consequences of its disdain for the international system. The international community should implement the fact-finding mission's recommendations, end the settlement activities and ensure accountability for human rights violations. Israel should withdraw all of its settlers from occupied Palestine and compensate its Palestinian victims.

55. **Mr. El Mkhantar** (Morocco) said that widespread sociopolitical upheavals and crises constituted significant challenges to the Council's work. Only concerted action would enhance its visibility and ensure that its efforts on the ground and in building States' capacity to meet their human rights commitments were transparent, professional and independent. The Council had often established a common position regarding a particular situation in order to send a strong message from the international community and it played a crucial role in ensuring respect for justice, equity and equality. The establishment of a human rights system based on openness, understanding, dialogue and consultation would foster a spirit of compromise and enhance cooperation. The Council should maintain the momentum of its work to counter doctrines of hate, exclusion and racism. He reminded the Committee that the 1965 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, produced by a working group chaired by Morocco and adopted while Morocco was Vice-Chair of the Committee, had been the first such instrument to be accompanied by an implementation monitoring mechanism.

56. **Mr. Raja Zaib Shah** (Malaysia) said that his delegation supported the proposal that the Committee should take action on the recommendations made by the Human Rights Council, which would allow fuller treatment of human rights issues. It was encouraging to note that the Council's work had continued in accordance with General Assembly resolution 65/281 and Council resolution 16/21.

57. The challenges described in the report were a reminder that human rights issues should be addressed

through enhanced cooperation and dialogue, without selectivity or double standards. The human rights situation in some parts of the world was deteriorating because of conflict, political upheaval and foreign occupation. The international community should exercise moderation and refrain from taking unilateral action to resolve those conflicts. Although various country-specific situations required the Council's attention, thematic issues should be given a higher priority. The global economic crisis continued to affect vulnerable groups, while global warning was causing natural disasters, soil quality was deteriorating and population increases were causing food insecurity. Member States should therefore uphold economic and social rights and the right to food through their economic policies.

58. His delegation supported the efforts of the President of the Council to strengthen the universal periodic review and ensure the equal treatment of all Member States. The review was a more credible and transparent means of promoting human rights than the country-specific resolutions preferred by some States. Those participating in the Council's work should discuss human rights issues with dignity and respect.

59. **Ms. Changtrakul** (Thailand) said that her Government supported the efforts to improve the work of the Council and strengthen human rights instruments, and had participated in the working group which had drafted the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Work in the field of human rights should be based on the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, inclusivity, democracy and the rule of law. In view of the increasingly broad scope of the work of OHCHR, therefore, she urged the members of the Fifth Committee to increase its regular budget. The Office's efficiency should also be improved through better priority-setting, although not at the expense of field operations. While not wishing to encourage undue dependence on voluntary contributions, her delegation welcomed the increase in contributions that were not earmarked for specific uses.

60. A balance should be found in the draft thematic strategies of OHCHR for the period 2014-2017 between economic, social and cultural rights and civil and political rights. Human rights and the rule of law should be incorporated in the post-2015 development agenda and respected throughout the United Nations system.

61. At the twenty-fourth session of the Council, her Government had announced its first contribution to the Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights. Technical assistance and capacity-building would help States to implement the recommendations of various bodies and fulfil their human rights obligations. Thailand would be a candidate for a second term as Council member for the period 2015-2017.

62. **Mr. Agamah** (Nigeria) said that the Council had made much progress in carrying out its mandate and that the universal periodic review was one of its major successes. The equal allocation of speaking time for all delegations was a positive development. Nigeria noted with appreciation the work carried out by the Council's Task Force on Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities and called for more facilities to expand their participation in the activities of the Council. The greater transparency afforded by webcasts of regular and special sessions was also commendable.

63. Nigeria was concerned by the financial constraints faced by special procedures mandate holders, who played crucial roles in the promotion and protection of human rights, and called on the General Assembly to allocate adequate resources to them from the regular budget. It was not ideal to have 45 per cent of their funding coming from voluntary contributions.

64. Nigeria recognized the important role played by civil society and welcomed the access that the Council granted to NGOs in its willingness to ensure that the voice of the people was heard. His delegation remained committed to working in a constructive manner with its counterparts to advance the work of the Human Rights Council.

65. **Ms. Mørch Smith** (Norway) said that her delegation commended the President of the Council for securing Israel's participation in the universal periodic review, which had confirmed the universality and legitimacy of the process. The Council was increasingly capable of addressing a wide range of important human rights challenges, taking decisions that made a difference on the ground and establishing mandates that secured monitoring, analysis and policy making in many difficult and complex areas. In that regard, she cited the adoption in 2013 of several resolutions on the protection of human rights defenders, on reprisals and on creating space for civil society; the establishment of four new country-specific

mandates; and the endorsement in 2011 of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which helped to provide a crucial drive for business reforms and government initiatives to improve working and living conditions in all regions. While Norway valued the Council as a forum with strong potential for fact-based cross-regional agreement on issues of increasing global importance, it would have liked to see stronger decisions taken, including on the protection and promotion of the rights of women and of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and on country-specific human rights crises.

66. The work of the Council was expanding but its secretariat, OHCHR, and Member States were unable to keep pace with the new initiatives in Geneva and in the field. In a context of chronic under-funding, further cuts had been proposed in the regular budget of OHCHR. The Office increasingly depended on voluntary contributions, including for mandatory activities and field operations. Member States should ensure that OHCHR could fulfil its mandate in the light of increasing demands. With ever more panel debates and interactive dialogues and record-breaking numbers of resolutions in 2013, smaller missions were unable to follow the increasingly heavy agenda in a suitable manner. States would have to address that situation in 2014 as it was not sustainable and could impair the quality of the Council's work.

67. **Mr. Errázuriz** (Chile) said that Chile believed in the enormous potential to be tapped when women exercised their rights and had long been promoting the mainstreaming of gender in all areas of the United Nations work and was committed to the implementation of Council resolution 6/30, as evidenced by Chile's annual organization of two Council panels on gender issues. His country had also supported a proactive approach and the Council resolutions that addressed the numerous and increasing threats and attacks against civil society actors. Given the many activities and initiatives implemented by the Council, it was essential for those actors to be able to seek, secure and utilize the resources needed to achieve their goals. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of Council resolution 24/24, so that the United Nations could respond in a unified, rapid and effective manner to dissuade those attacks.

68. Chile advocated a cooperative, gradual, flexible and comprehensive approach to addressing human rights situations, particular in country-specific contexts, in accordance with the mandate and powers of the Council. Ignoring such situations would risk permanently undermining its credibility. That was important not only for cases of technical assistance, but also for situations that required the attention of the Council under item 4 of its agenda and where warning, denunciation or emergency mechanisms could be used as necessary. In such cases, Chile had always favoured cross-regional initiatives.

69. The Council had played an important role in the grave crisis in the Syrian Arab Republic, and had recently adopted its thirteenth resolution on that issue. Chile supported the Council's call for a negotiated political solution to the crisis. His country had repeatedly emphasized the urgent need to bring an end to all forms of violence, regardless of its origin, as well as the need for accountability. Furthermore, cognizant of the complexities of conflict and eager to reduce any aggravating factors, his delegation had also voted in favour of Council resolution 24/35 on the impact of arms transfer on human rights in armed conflict. It was vital for the Council to send the right message in requesting States to refrain from selling weapons to parties in an armed conflict when they risked being used to commit or facilitate serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law.

70. **Mr. Eshragh Jahromi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) reaffirmed his country's support for the work and function of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and her Office, within the mandate set out in document A/48/141. Continued efforts were needed to ensure that the Council was a medium of constructive dialogue and cooperation and to avoid selectivity, double standards and politicization of human rights.

71. The Republic of Iran, along with other developing countries, had actively contributed to the work of the Council with a view to preventing the long-standing politicization and manipulation of the mechanism by a few countries. Council resolution 22/23, which had been adopted as a result of strenuous attempts by certain countries, and the appointment of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran were superfluous and unfair in view of Iran's ongoing cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms. The universal periodic review was designed to prevent the monopolization of the human rights machinery by a few States and to monitor and address the human rights situations of all Member States. It was therefore

unfortunate that certain countries reverted to the practice of the disparaged Human Rights Commission by proposing country-specific resolutions in the Human Rights Council, to the detriment of the Council's cooperative approach. His country's unyielding and genuine commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights was based on the noble values and principles of Islam enshrined in the Constitution and, despite the aforementioned political attacks, it would maintain its close cooperation with the Council to realize their shared objectives.

72. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa) said that his country supported the mandate of the Human Rights Council, which was a subsidiary body of the General Assembly. As such, the discussion of its decisions and resolutions should not be duplicated in the Third Committee. South Africa remained committed to the spirit and vision embodied in article 13 of the Proclamation of Teheran concerning economic, social and cultural rights and the role of sound and effective national and international economic and social development policies. As the current financial and economic crises would have a negative effect on the equal implementation of the Council's numerous recommendations, the universal periodic review had a pivotal role in the work of the Council with regard to States' fulfilment of their human rights obligations and improving the situation on the ground. The United Nations Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review must therefore be adequately funded.

73. South Africa attached great importance to the work of OHCHR within its mandate as outlined in General Assembly resolution 48/141 and called for a more visible allocation of resources. The Office should also ensure that the post-2015 development agenda did not deflect attention from the achievement of the Millennium Developments Goals. His delegation appreciated the Council's work in the practical enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights — though more could be done in that area — as well as in the area of human rights responsibilities of transnational corporations.

74. Programmes, decisions and resolutions addressing racism and discrimination must be fully implemented and funded. Deeply concerned about the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015, which reduced funding for the follow-up and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action and associated fellowship programmes, his delegation reiterated the call for a more equitable allocation of funding to implement the Programme of Action. South Africa attached great importance to decisions and resolutions on the matter and remained concerned about the lack of progress in ensuring that the Group of Eminent Persons fulfilled its mandate. His country also welcomed the attention given by the Council to the situation of human rights in the occupied Palestinian territories, as the practical enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms hinged on the realisation of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian peoples.

75. Recent attempts to erode the provisions of the Council's institution-building text compromised the work, authority and credibility of the Council. It was incumbent on the Council to promote dialogue and cooperation consistently; matters with serious political ramifications should always be considered by the full membership of the General Assembly. South Africa therefore shared the concerns expressed by other delegations with regard to the adoption of Council resolution 24/24 and the designation of a United Nations-wide senior focal point on reprisals. The matter required further reflection and deliberation by the General Assembly, and domestic jurisprudence should be utilized to deal adequately with intimidation or reprisals.

76. **Mr. Alimbayev** (Kazakhstan) said that Kazakhstan was committed to the fundamental principles of international law, which were pivotal for a sustainable, universal and effective global human rights architecture. Consequently, appropriate budgeting and strengthening of the Council and its special procedures, the universal periodic review mechanism and institution of Special Rapporteurs were required, as was support for other United Nations human rights mechanisms. It was also necessary to implement civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights at national, regional and global levels, paying particular attention to vulnerable groups. The Council should always maintain a balance between political and civil rights, and economic, social and cultural rights and it must also respond effectively and consistently to the many challenges that it faced.

77. His Government was firmly committed to strengthening its cooperation with the human rights treaty bodies. Kazakhstan had acceded to almost all of the main international human rights instruments and

had extended a standing invitation to all special procedures mandate holders, four of whom had visited Kazakhstan in the previous four years.

78. There was an urgent need to reinforce international stability and security. The constructive interaction of peoples, religions and States was particularly important. Kazakhstan had consistently called for a strengthening of the global human rights protection architecture to raise the profile of the charter-based and treaty-based human rights bodies. A critical analysis of events at international, regional and domestic levels would help to protect society from many forms of extremism in the future. Rather than avoiding the consideration of complex issues, the Council should carry out efficient and constructive monitoring and take balanced decisions. The Council should also build the confidence of Member States and further develop an equitable dialogue by ensuring that external sources of information were reliable and by allowing Member States the right of reply.

79. **Mr. Ntwaagae** (Botswana) said that his delegation called on OHCHR to continue to engage with other human rights mechanisms to streamline resources, both human and financial. The dialogue with the President of the Human Rights Council was in no way intended to reopen debates or undermine the decisions and conclusions reached in Geneva. Botswana continued to participate actively in the proceedings of the Council, contributing to the adoption of resolutions and decisions and noted with satisfaction that Member States had actively engaged through the universal periodic review mechanism to further strengthen their national human rights policies and programmes. He was also pleased to report that Botswana had agreed to almost 90 per cent of the recommendations stemming from the second cycle of the universal periodic review in early 2013.

80. Botswana shared the concern of many States with regard to the proliferation of Council mandates. Some of the newly created mandates overlapped with previously existing ones and might hinder the Council's efficiency and effectiveness; the situation had already overburdened OHCHR. His delegation therefore called on OHCHR to streamline its work and consider mainstreaming human rights in the United Nations system. The treaty body strengthening process should help to address the challenges faced by OHCHR. Those concerns notwithstanding, Botswana valued the work of the special procedures mandate holders and the important role of the treaty bodies in monitoring the implementation by States parties of human rights instruments.

81. While no country had a perfect human rights record, his delegation remained concerned about the deteriorating situation in some countries, including some that were still on the Council's agenda. Botswana therefore encouraged Member States to respect their human rights obligations under international human rights and humanitarian law.

82. **Mr. Rahman** (Bangladesh) said that the universal periodic review mechanism had proved its universality and effectiveness by being non-selective and by involving all States regardless of size, influence or level of development. The peer review had the potential to create an environment of trust and mutual understanding. Bangladesh had always supported the work of the Council, as demonstrated by the country's acceptance of as many as 164 recommendations from Member States during the second cycle of the review process early in 2013. While noting the importance of special procedures, their relevance, particularly that of country-specific mandates, should be re-examined in view of the growing popularity of the universal periodic review. Were the 50 existing mandates all necessary and were they not overstretching the capacity of OHCHR? The Council should exercise care in establishing new mandates to avoid unnecessary proliferation and duplication. Bangladesh appreciated the continued attention given to the human rights situation in the State of Palestine and urged the Council to remain seized of the issue until the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people was realized.

83. Turning to the recently adopted Council resolution 24/24, his delegation agreed that all acts of reprisal were unacceptable. However, it was concerned at the hasty decision to establish a United Nations focal point. An in-depth study of the usefulness of such a post was needed, particularly given the current austerity measures with regard to budgeting and post creation, even in critical areas. Furthermore, such a decision should only be taken through extensive consultation in the General Assembly. The Human Rights Council should focus on constructive dialogue within its mandate in order to bring real change through cooperation and mutual understanding, rather than naming and shaming or drawing attention to perceived shortcomings.

84. **Mr. Desta** (Eritrea) said that human rights were best promoted and protected through genuine dialogue and cooperation, for which the universal periodic review remained a valid mechanism. However, the novel and constructive approach of the review was undermined by some countries seeking to revert to past methods that had discredited the Commission on Human Rights. The Human Rights Council must address that serious challenge in order to maintain its credibility and legitimacy. It must move forward and would be effective in its mandate only by fully adhering to its founding tenets. The Council would be truly at the service of humanity if it eliminated double standards, selectivity and politicization of human rights issues and could elevate human rights standards through constructive engagement and institution building, as opposed to establishing politically motivated country-specific mandates. There should be no hierarchy among human rights and equal attention should be given to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, while integrating those rights in the post-2015 development agenda as a priority. The full enjoyment of all human rights could only be guaranteed in conditions of peace, security and stability.

85. **Mr. Alemu** (Ethiopia) said that national civil societies had an important contribution to make in the collective effort to promote and protect human rights, irrespective of ideology, religion, politics or gender. The Federal Constitution of Ethiopia fully guaranteed human rights and fundamental freedoms and welcomed the role of civil society in that area. Civil society actors contributed to democratic order and good governance through their work with various Government bodies. Their participation must, however, be in line with national legislation, the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and universally recognized international legal obligations, as well resolution 1996/31 of the Economic and Social Council. Civil society organizations must also recognize their responsibility to abide by domestic laws in carrying out their functions. Ethiopia's national legislation on civil society combined those critical and mutually reinforcing elements as the basis for harmonious collaboration between civil society and relevant Government institutions.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.46

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
6 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 14 November 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-56490 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.71: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Ms. Farngalo** (Liberia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that Austria, Finland, Georgia, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain and Turkey had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. One third of the world's internally displaced persons were in Africa, and their numbers had increased significantly over the previous two years. Insecurity resulting from conflicts had not only uprooted millions of people, but also prevented many from returning home. The draft resolution underlined the need to draw on Africa's experience in dealing with displaced persons and returnees and to provide sustained financial support to meet the needs of those persons despite difficulties in mobilizing funding.

2. There were a few differences from the previous year's text: the General Assembly welcomed the entry into force of the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa and welcomed the ongoing implementation of pledges made by States in 2011 to mark the sixtieth anniversary of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the fiftieth anniversary of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. It also welcomed the Executive Committee's recent adoption of the Conclusion on civil registration and requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report on assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa to the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session.

3. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Guinea, Ireland, Lithuania, Pakistan, Sweden and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.69)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.69: Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

4. **Ms. Rokovucago** (Fiji), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, requested the Secretariat to amend the title to "Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action". In response to requests to streamline the draft resolution, the text had been shortened from 13 to 4 pages.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.67 and A/C.3/68/L.68)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.67: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

5. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, Rwanda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

6. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Nigeria had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.68: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

7. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Albania, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Chile, Comoros, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The text was very similar to that of the previous year's resolution, with changes to the eighth and eleventh preambular

paragraphs. He hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would help to alleviate the suffering of the Palestinian people and eventually lead to the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination in their own independent State of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital.

8. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Monaco, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Uganda and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.47, A/C.3/68/L.49, A/C.3/68/L.53, A/C.3/68/L.61 and A/C.3/68/L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.49: Freedom of religion or belief

9. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that Brazil, Japan, Lebanon and Paraguay had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution reflected the strong commitment of the European Union to promoting universal human rights, as demonstrated by its new Guidelines on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief, and was intended as a follow-up action to the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. The European Union called on States to implement recommendations relating to freedom of religion or belief that were made in the context of the universal periodic review.

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

11. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Ghana, Lebanon, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Uganda had joined the sponsors. He said that the draft resolution was particularly relevant in view of the upcoming negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda; the text emphasized the importance of putting development at the top of the international economic agenda and of narrowing the gap between rich and poor as a way of promoting human rights. Only minor changes had been made to the previous year's text; in the first paragraph of the draft resolution, the reference to the Charter of the United Nations had been changed from "guided by" to "reaffirming".

12. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Pakistan, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Togo and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.53: Follow-up to the International Year of Human Rights Learning

13. **Ms. Mballa Eyenga** (Cameroon), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that Azerbaijan and Spain had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution was based on the text adopted two years previously, with a few updates. Paragraph 8, the only new paragraph, had been discussed at great length.

14. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia and Slovenia had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.61: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

15. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Paraguay had joined the sponsors. Measures adopted to combat terrorism would only be effective and legitimate if States fulfilled their duty to promote and protect human rights. The draft resolution was intended to strengthen the human rights perspective in the provision of assistance to victims of terrorism and contained a stronger reference to the right of victims to

reparations. States were urged to guarantee that all measures adopted in the fight against terrorism, including the use of drones, complied with their obligations under international law and were reminded of the need to promptly conduct impartial inquiries if there were plausible indications of breaches of those obligations.

16. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Monaco and Peru had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.63: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

17. **Ms. Morch Smith** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malta, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom had joined the sponsors. The sponsors had agreed on new wording in four areas: the role of development actors in finding durable solutions, the importance of developing domestic legislation and policies, the vulnerability and participation of women and the need to provide children with access to education.

18. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mali, Monaco, Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.42)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.42: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

19. **Mr. Alyas** (Saudi Arabia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Albania, Andorra, Bahrain, Denmark, Hungary, Malta, Mauritania, Panama, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Vanuatu and Yemen had joined the list of sponsors. It was unfortunately once again necessary to present a draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic in view of the recent deterioration in that situation. The innocent victims in Syria were looking to the United Nations to condemn the Government of Syria, given the inability of the international community to take the necessary measures to put an end to the tragedy affecting that country. The text of the present draft resolution was based on that of previous United Nations resolutions, including those of the Human Rights Council, taking account of recent developments on the ground.

20. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

21. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution, which constituted an attack against his country, had been introduced by the representative of a State that was not concerned about allowing its own citizens to enjoy fundamental freedoms, human rights and democracy. The draft resolution was yet another futile attempt by the Saudi regime and its allies to interfere in Syria's internal affairs; it made false claims and deliberately disregarded the Syrian Government's positive approach to finding a peaceful, political solution to the crisis in the country through cooperation and dialogue between Syrians.

22. Saudi Arabia had no parliament or constitution and prohibited women from driving or even cycling, and yet it had the audacity to challenge a country in which a woman held the office of Vice-President. The Saudi regime's real concern was Syria's balanced and objective approach to Arab identity and Islam, which ran counter to the *takfiri* Wahhabi terrorist approach sponsored by Saudi Arabia.

23. His delegation had met with many other delegations and regional groups to underline the contradictions contained in the text. The draft resolution was clearly a political manoeuvre; it was biased, contained numerous errors and contradictions, and would not help to find a political solution to the crisis. It merely aggravated the crisis by ignoring the positive progress achieved and turned attention away from the activities of terrorist groups linked to Al-Qaida which were supported by certain Member States, including the sponsors of the draft resolution.

24. The purpose of the draft resolution was to undermine the Geneva II conference. He recalled that Saudi Arabia had been the only State to refuse a recent visit from the Joint Special Representative of the United Nations and the League of Arab States for Syria. His delegation would request a vote before adoption of the draft resolution and urged all States to vote against it, since the United Nations was supposed to assist all States and not target individual ones. In targeting his country, Saudi Arabia was violating the

joint position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which it was a member.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.46 and A/C.3/68/L.70)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.46: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

25. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

26. **Ms. Salovaara** (Finland), said that Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Kenya, Micronesia (the Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Thailand and Ukraine had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. The text had been negotiated in both Geneva and New York, and it was intended to serve as a vehicle for the General Assembly's continued support for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

27. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belarus, Benin, Burundi, Eritrea, Gabon, Honduras, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste and Uganda had also joined the sponsors.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.46 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.70: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

29. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

30. **Ms. Skácelová** (Czech Republic), introducing the draft resolution, said that the original seven sponsors — Afghanistan, Belarus, Czech Republic, Latvia, Peru, Senegal and Slovakia — had expressed their interest in becoming members of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

31. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Papua New Guinea and the Russian Federation had also joined the sponsors.

32. **Mr. Bonser** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the decision to enlarge the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to include Afghanistan, Czech Republic, Latvia, Peru, Senegal and Slovakia, but was firmly opposed to the inclusion of Belarus. His Government maintained a policy of limited engagement with the Government of Belarus, owing to the deplorable state of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in that country, where the Government continued to restrict its citizens' ability to exercise their fundamental rights. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had a mandate to protect vulnerable persons the world over; Canada could only object to the proposal that President Lukashenko's dictatorial regime, which continued to repress and suppress the rights of ordinary Belarusians, should join that Office's Executive Committee. Canada supported freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Belarus and would continue to work with like-minded countries and international organizations to ensure that the people of Belarus could exercise those fundamental rights.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.70 was adopted.*

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.73)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1: Human Rights Committee

34. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.3/68/L.73.

35. **Ms. Pöysäri** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries and the other sponsors of the draft resolution, said that Croatia, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Suriname and Turkey had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which authorized the addition of one week of meeting time for the Committee in 2014,

including an adequate level of Secretariat resources as a measure to deal urgently with the backlog of communications under the first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights awaiting consideration. The adoption of the draft resolution would help to address that critical situation and to foster more tangible results in the treaty-body strengthening process.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Côte d'Ivoire, Tunisia and Ukraine had also joined the sponsors.

37. **Ms. Torres** (United States of America) said that her delegation supported the important work of the Human Rights Committee and other treaty bodies, and their role in advising States parties on implementation issues. The work of the Human Rights Committee was essential to the promotion and protection of rights under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The persistent backlog of reports and individual petitions remained a concern for Member States and other stakeholders, and a challenge to the ability of the Human Rights Committee to fully discharge its responsibilities. Her delegation appreciated the sponsors' efforts to identify additional cost-saving measures to minimize the budgetary impact of the Committee's request for additional meeting time.

38. While firmly supporting the goal of strengthening and enhancing the effectiveness of all human rights treaty bodies, including the Human Rights Committee, her delegation recognized that there were limits to Member States' ability to provide the necessary resources. Her own country's funding for international organizations had decreased significantly, while calls for closer scrutiny of the use and effectiveness of that funding had increased. Her delegation therefore called for an end to the practice of providing additional funding outside of the normal budget cycle, unless truly unforeseen and urgent humanitarian or security needs arose. Ad-hoc or stop-gap measures could undermine broader efforts to improve effectiveness and strengthen the treaty body system, and could ultimately be much more costly than systematic solutions.

39. Although the draft resolution was aimed primarily at reducing the backlog of individual petitions before the Human Rights Committee, her delegation had serious reservations vis-à-vis the effectiveness of solely adding meeting time, as other associated measures were also critical. The challenge of backlogs of reports and individual petitions was endemic to the treaty body system, and the backlogs were likely to increase as new Member States acceded to the human rights treaties and as optional protocols and related mechanisms entered into force. The treaty body system as a whole needed strengthening and her delegation therefore had not joined the consensus on the draft resolution. The international community should address those issues in a systematic and comprehensive way in the future.

40. **Ms. Belskaya** (Belarus), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that Belarus was a party to the majority of the international human rights instruments and attached great importance to the work of the treaty bodies. Her delegation noted with concern the significant backlog of communications awaiting review by the Human Rights Committee. That backlog, one of the largest backlogs in the treaty body system, was the result of not only the number of communications, but also the Committee's questionable formats and methods of work, which were mostly based on the Committee's internal rules of procedure and in some cases were not in keeping with or even contravened the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto. The draft resolution thus sent an incongruous signal to the Committee and the States parties. The main sponsor had failed to take the submissions and proposals of her delegation into account during the negotiations, which had not been conducted in a transparent manner, and had failed to take into account the views of all interested parties. Belarus was a party to both the Covenant and to the Optional Protocol and it had the right, as a contributor to the United Nations budget, to participate in the allocation of budgetary resources. The main sponsors should adopt a more responsive, impartial, and constructive approach in preparing draft resolutions on such important issues. Her delegation deeply regretted that the sponsors had not managed to carry out the simple task of preparing a procedural resolution and reducing expenditure as much as possible.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted.*

42. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that the significant backlog in individual communications was a matter for concern. She underscored the urgency of concluding the intergovernmental process on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system in February 2014 to ensure a

strengthened treaty body system that could effectively and efficiently defend human rights while operating within its budget. It was important to find a long-term solution to that issue, rather than an ad-hoc financial measure. Her delegation's position was to avoid programme budget implications where possible. On that basis alone, Canada had not joined the consensus, but awaited the results of the intergovernmental process.

43. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) also shared the concern about the backlog in communications awaiting consideration by the Human Rights Committee, a situation which required not an ad-hoc solution, but a long-term one. The intergovernmental process was the best means to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, and to avoid additional budgetary implications. In the light of the severe financial situation facing the United Nations, it was regrettable that additional costs would be incurred by adding a week of meeting time. His delegation also had some concerns about the process itself, which had not taken into account the concerns of all States or provided sufficient opportunity for discussion. It also had doubts about the need for general temporary assistance at the P-3 level for 24 months. Japan attached great importance to the Committee's activities and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but needed further explanation from the Secretariat concerning the rationale and calculation for the estimated $1.5 million in additional resource requirements, which should be examined carefully through the budgetary process. The Secretariat should also try to absorb any additional costs within the proposed programme budget for the 2014-2015 biennium, and he hoped that the Human Rights Committee would further improve the efficiency of its working methods, in line with paragraph 1 of the resolution.

44. **Ms. Cross** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but had concerns about the approach taken in that document as a solution was needed for a much wider problem. The genuine problems and heavy workload of the Human Rights Committee were a reflection of the Committee's success. A comprehensive solution was needed for the backlog of work which continued to accumulate. Her delegation welcomed the steps the Committee had taken to make its working methods more efficient, but the ad-hoc solution of lengthening the meeting time did not solve the problem. Her delegation was firmly committed to the treaty body strengthening process In future, a holistic approach should be adopted rather than ineffective and costly ad-hoc solutions.

45. **Mr. Cabouat** (France) said that his delegation attached great importance to the work of the Human Rights Committee and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but had some reservations about the approach adopted. The backlog was a cross-cutting issue that affected other treaty-bodies too, and it required a long-term and comprehensive solution. The initiative of adding meeting time could undermine current efforts for overall reform of the treaty bodies overall. It was crucial for committees to ensure that any changes to their working methods did not entail additional budgetary costs. It was in that constructive spirit that the budgetary implications of the draft resolution would be reviewed in the Fifth Committee.

46. **Ms. Hewanpola** (Australia) said that the treaty body system was the key international mechanism for the promotion and protection of human rights globally; enhancing its effective functioning was clearly critical. In the light of the pressures faced by that system, it was imperative to conclude the work of the General Assembly's intergovernmental process during the final phase of discussions in February 2014 and to agree on a substantive, comprehensive and long-term solution to strengthen the operations and effectiveness of the treaty body system. Her Government supported the work of the Human Rights Committee, including its consideration of individual communications, but the draft resolution sought only a temporary fix to one of the many issues faced by that Committee.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.41 and A/C.3/68/L.72)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

47. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

48. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, India, Indonesia,

Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Morocco, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Thailand, Tuvalu, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia had also joined the sponsors.

49. The draft resolution had more than 90 sponsors, reflecting every region of the world. In line with the previous relevant resolution, the current one reaffirmed that democracy was a universal value based on the freely expressed will of the people to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural systems and their full participation in all aspects of their lives. It also included elements that had been incorporated in previous General Assembly resolutions on elections, recognizing the importance of free, fair, periodic, and genuine elections, including in new democracies and countries undergoing democratization, in order to empower citizens to express their will and promote successful transitions to sustainable democracies. The text also included two crucial new elements: the participation of women in the political and electoral process; and the unique challenges that persons with disabilities faced in participating in electoral processes, including physical barriers to participation.

50. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire and Madagascar had also joined the sponsors.

51. **The Chair** drew attention to draft amendment A/C.3/68/L.72 to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41, and noted that the amendment had no programme budget implications.

52. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 were extremely important for strengthening democratic institutions in Member States, as well as in terms of the international community providing assistance to those institutions. His delegation supported many of the elements contained in the text, but since its own proposals had not been included, it had been obliged to prepare a separate draft amendment (A/C.3/68/L.72).

53. The amendment reflected his delegation's wish, as expressed at the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to remove the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, as they had not been the result of any intergovernmental experts' agreement or part of any intergovernmental process. His delegation was opposed in principle to the attempt to legitimize, by a General Assembly resolution, documents developed by a group of non-governmental organizations when those documents had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation fully supported the aim of harmonizing the methods and standards for international election observation, as expressed in the first part of paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, as his delegation had long advocated such action at various levels, including in the context of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

54. His delegation believed that the draft amendment made the draft resolution more balanced. Should the amendment be deemed unacceptable by the sponsors of the draft resolution, he would request a recorded vote and appeal for the Committee to support.

55. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Syrian Arab Republic and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had joined the sponsors to the draft amendment.

56. **Ms. Torres** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote against the amendment to paragraph 11 and encouraged other delegations to do same. With its proposed amendment, the Russian delegation sought to delete consensus language that had been included in the relevant draft resolution for nearly a decade; the Committee and the General Assembly had agreed on that language, which merely reflected appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which had been endorsed by the African Union, European Commission, the Organization of American States and many other organizations. She urged delegations to vote against the proposed amendment, just as they had done in 2009 and 2011.

57. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft amendment contained in A/C.3/68/L.72.

58. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.72, contained in document A/C.3/68/L.41.*

In favour:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian

Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Zambia.

59. *The proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 contained in document A/C.3/68/L.72 was rejected by 94 votes to 29, with 33 abstentions.*

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 as a whole was adopted.*[1]

[1] The delegation of Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution, and the delegation of Burundi that it had intended to abstain.

61. **Mr. Matlhako** (South Africa) said that South Africa, as a State party to the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, had participated constructively in the consultations on the resolution. His Government was concerned at some aspects of the text, in particular the description of the type of environment that would be conducive to elections. It was assumed that all States were at the same level of development with regard to election preparations. The text also failed to fully address all aspects of election logistics, which hinged on the availability of human and financial resources, including the role of the judiciary.

62. It was difficult to understand the decision to reject language based on paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Furthermore, the comprehensive contributions made by his delegation had not been taken into account. He hoped that the main sponsor would adopt a different approach in any future negotiations.

63. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that the language of the final preambular paragraph of the resolution did not take into account the earlier discussions regarding the need for a human rights focus in the post-2015 development agenda. That focus should be fully supported by an analysis of the interdependency of the various categories of human rights. Cuba did not agree with a selective focus that prioritised certain elements in terms of human rights and democracy, as such an approach was detrimental to economic, social and cultural rights. With regard to democracy, genuine and periodic elections were just one requirement for ensuring the participation and full enjoyment by peoples of the riches generated by their labour and the use of natural resources.

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1: Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons

64. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, drew the attention of the Committee to paragraphs 4, 8, 12, 16 and 18 of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/293, two

regular budget posts had been approved under section 16 of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Accordingly, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) had one regular budget post allocated for the delivery of technical assistance in the fields of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, and one regular budget post dedicated to the preparation of the Global Report on Trafficking in Persons. No additional resources would be required for the four-year appraisal if it was conducted in the same manner as in May 2013.

65. Drawing attention to the actions required to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, he noted that UNODC had received an earmarked contribution of $600,000 in 2012 to support its coordinating role in the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT) and the production of five thematic papers to be used in technical assistance activities. An increased level of activities in 2013 would require additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $482,800.

66. UNODC would require additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $946,000 over three years to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 12, and additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $154,100 to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 16. With regard to the activities related to the request made in paragraph 18, additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $71,800 would be required for a 16-page report in six languages and a professional post at the P-4 level for two months for preparation of that report. Should the additional extrabudgetary resources referred to not be available, the activities would not take place.

67. **Mr. Lazarev** (Belarus), introducing the draft resolution, said that Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, India, Italy, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Portugal, Serbia, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. Since the adoption of the first resolution on crime prevention and criminal justice, the Inter-agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT) and the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children had been established, and the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons had been adopted. In September 2013, Belarus had initiated consultations with civil society to discuss the implementation of international efforts to counter human trafficking.

68. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burkina Faso, Lesotho, Niger and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

69. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), said that trafficking in persons was one of the most dangerous forms of transnational organized crime and was carried out by highly organized criminal groups that undermined the rule of law. CSTO called for concrete actions to implement the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and welcomed the designation of a world day against trafficking in persons, which would help to raise the awareness of the international community and consolidate the efforts of all partners in that respect.

70. CSTO also supported the idea of a periodic appraisal of the implementation of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons because it would encourage international cooperation and would support cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. The experience of CSTO in combating illegal migration, which was often linked to trafficking in persons, could be of interest to many other States and international organizations. CSTO member States confirmed their willingness to address the issue of organized crime through international cooperation.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.*

72. **Ms. Hampe** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that she commended the efforts of Belarus to raise awareness about the situation of victims of human trafficking and to promote and protect their human rights. However, rather than designating a world day, it might have been more effective to make use of existing synergies for that purpose. The May 2013 High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons had demonstrated the importance of promoting and protecting the rights of victims and the essential role of civil society in the efforts to combat human trafficking.

73. Any future appraisal of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, including the implementation of relevant legal instruments, should

allow for the action-oriented assessment of gaps and challenges and include the participation of all relevant stakeholders. The appraisal should also be conducted within existing resources.

74. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocols, in particular the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, were the main legal instruments for the efforts to combat human trafficking. The Global Plan of Action was a complementary instrument for those efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

75. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

76. **Mr. Manana** (Uganda), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that criminal activity remained a major impediment to the socioeconomic development of the African continent. Transnational organized crime in particular was a serious cause for concern in view of Africa's weak crime prevention structures. The United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders had been established to address the increasing levels of crime and delinquency that threatened to subvert development efforts in African countries.

77. Continued efforts to strengthen collaboration and forge new partnerships would enhance the Institute's ability to conduct its work. The draft resolution retained much of the language from the texts of previous years, while several changes had been made to reflect new developments.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.